

sy



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/259,589	03/01/1999	DAVID JOHN MARTIN PATTERSON	06502.0225	5471

22852 7590 02/13/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

TANG, KENNETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/259,589

Applicant(s)

PATTERSON, DAVID JOHN
MARTIN

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final action is in response to paper number 5, Amendment A, which was received on November 27, 2002. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 10, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chorn (US 6,275,843), in view of Abe et al. (hereinafter Abe) (US 6,052,695), and in further view of Simor (US 5,060,150).

Referring to claims 1, 10, 11 and 17, Chorn discloses the following system:

- A resource manager operable to control the allocation of a resource to competing computing processes ("Resource Manager provides access to a resource", col 7, lines 8-10, Figure 1, 16 and 36).
- The resource manager responds to identification of a thread for the first process requesting resource allocation ("thread identifiers" used to "manage its resources for the

processing”, col 14, lines 36-43, and “first service request”, Fig 4, 102, and col 9, lines 50-54);

Chorn fails to explicitly teach a joining function that notifies a resource manger with at least a first and second process, where there is termination of thread for second process to allocate the resource to the thread for the first process. However, Abe teaches this limitation in column 27, lines 40-47). In there he teaches of returning the output completion notification of the second thread. When this notification is received, the second log processing thread (65-M) terminates its own processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature to the existing system of Chorn for the reason of increasing control by knowing when an existing thread is finished processing so that a new one can start processing.

Chorn also fails to teach that after termination of thread for a second process, the resource of the first process is allocated. However, Simor discloses a “Process Termination Monitor” that allows for resource allocation after the process has been terminated (col 17, lines 55-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this resource allocation feature to the existing system for the reason of being able to distribute resources to various locations.

3. Claims 2-7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chorn (US 6,275,843) in view of Abe (US 6,052,695), in further view of Simor (US 5,060,150), and in further view of Hoffpauir (US H1,896).

Referring to claim 2, Chorn in view of Abe fails to explicitly teach a resource manager comprising an object-oriented computer software operable in an object-oriented environment. However, Hoffpauir teaches that a “resource manager application 58 is preferably implemented in software using object-oriented programming” (col 13, lines 8-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include using object-oriented software to the existing combination system for the reason of increasing the efficiency of code from reusability benefits of object orientation.

Referring to claim 3, Chorn in view of Abe fails to explicitly teach the processes having software applications operable in the objected oriented environment. However, Hoffpauir teaches having “various software processes or applications that include software objects” (col 9, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of having software applications operable in the objected oriented environment to the existing combination system for the reason of increasing the efficiency of code from reusability benefits of object orientation.

Referring to claims 4 and 5, the reference of Hoffpauir teaches that “various computer software objects may be developed using virtually any computer programming language but will preferably be developed using a computer language designed for object oriented programming such as C++ and JAVA” (col 11, lines 50-55). Hoffpauir also teaches using a single object or bean object with the resource manager (“resource manager provides a proxy object for each object or application”, col 13, lines 12-22). It would be obvious to use more than one object with

Art Unit: 2127

the resource manager because it gives more opportunities for object orientation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the feature of comprising one or more objects registrable with the resource manager and in the JAVA language to the existing combination system for the reason of increasing the efficiency of code from the reusability benefits of object orientation.

Referring to claim 6, Hoffpauir teaches an “object” (90) acquiring “clients” such as a “configuration management server 72, the fault management server 74, the performance management server 76, accounting management server 78 and the system management server 82” (col 21, lines 36-43).

Referring to claims 7 and 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 5 from above.

4. Claim 8, 9, 12-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chorn (US 6,275,843) in view of Abe (US 6,052,695), in further view of Simor (US 5,060,150), and in further view of Hoffpauir (H1,918).

Referring to claims 8, 12 and 19, Chorn in view of Abe fails to explicitly teach a resource manager operable to control access by a plurality of telecommunications applications to a telephony device in a telecommunications apparatus, including at least a first process and a second process. However, Hoffpauir teaches a “resource manager” which controls access to a

Art Unit: 2127

plurality of telecommunications applications such as a switching module (Fig 2, 64), a telephony support module 66, a signal processing module 68 and an interface module 62, where each of these modules preferably includes software and communicates with the resource manager application of the call processor 40” – connected to a telephony device 22 (col 19, lines 58-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of control access by a plurality of telecommunications applications to a telephony device to the existing combination system for the reason of increasing functionality with telecommunication abilities.

Referring to claim 9, the reference of Abe discloses a mechanism for controlling “dispatching commands” to a “signal transmission network” (Fig 1 and col 9, lines 48-63).

Referring to claims 13 and 20, Chorn in view of Abe fails to explicitly teach using a telephony resource as an interface to the telecommunication network. However, Hoffpauir discloses a “signaling application” which “performs various functions and provides user interfaces associated with various parts and protocols” (col 13, lines 39-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the interface feature to the existing combination system for the reason of increasing the control by improving communication.

Referring to claims 14 and 21, Hoffpauir discloses “providing a modem to enable communication” for the telephony system, col 12, lines 24-30).

Referring to claim 15, Hoffpuir discloses a “call processing application” 54 from the call processor (col 13, lines 16-21).

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chorn (US 6,275,843) in view of Abe (US 6,052,695), in further view of Simor (US 5,060,150), in further view of Hoffpuir (H1,918), and further in view of Jones (US 5,193,110).

Referring to claim 16, the existing system fails to explicitly teach the following:

- a call answering application;
- a voicemail application;
- a facsimile application; and
- a data application.

However, Jones discloses a “call answering” service (col 20, lines 56-59), a “voice mail message service” (col 1, lines 15-24), a “facsimile processing service” (col 1, lines 15-24), and a “data” from an application or “data acquisition” (col 20, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine these features to the existing combination system for the reason of increasing functionality of the system by adding more communication means.

ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant argues on page 7, 3rd paragraph, that Chorn in view of Abe and in further view of Simor do not disclose or suggest claim 1. Specifically, the resource managers of Chorn do not allocate a resource to a thread for a first process responsive to termination of a thread for a second process (page 8, 2nd paragraph). Applicant admits that Abe discloses two sequential processes, first and second, respectively and that the first process is responsive to the second. However, Applicant argues on page 9, 1st paragraph, that Abe is not sufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Chorn because Abe is silent on allocating a resource to a thread for a first process responsive to termination of a thread for a second process. In response, Abe discloses “resource synchronization” for each transaction/process (*col. 10, lines 64-67 and col. 11, lines 1-10*). In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a second process allocate resources for the terminated first process because after the first process is terminated, it won't be able to allocate its own resources.

7. Applicant argues on page 9, 2nd paragraph, that Simor is not sufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Chorn and Abe because Simor does not allocate a resource to a thread for a first process responsive to the termination of a thread for a second process. In response, see the above argument 7.

8. Applicant argues on page 11, 1st paragraph, that Chorn in view of Abe and further in view of Hoffpauir 2 do not disclose or suggest at least a resource manager being operable in response

Art Unit: 2127

to termination of a thread for a second process to allocate a resource to a thread for a first process. Hoffpauir 2 fails to show allocating a resource to a thread for a first process responsive to termination of a thread for a second process. In response, see the above argument 7.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (703) 305-5334. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-6:00pm.

Art Unit: 2127

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin Oberley can be reached on (703)305-9716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

kt
February 6, 2003

MAJID BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER